

**ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
COMMISSION ON COURTS**



**Indiana Legislative Services Agency
200 W. Washington Street, Suite 301
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204**

October, 1999

INDIANA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

1999

Senator Robert Garton

Chairman

Columbus

Speaker John Gregg

Vice-Chairman

Sandborn

Senator Richard Young

Milltown

Representative Paul Mannweiler

Indianapolis

Senator Harold Wheeler

Larwill

Representative Mark Kruzan

Bloomington

Senator Joseph Harrison

Attica

Representative Dale Grubb

Covington

Senator Patricia Miller

Indianapolis

Representative William Cochran

New Albany

Senator Thomas Wyss

Fort Wayne

Representative Charlie Brown

Gary

Senator James Lewis

Charlestown

Representative Jeffrey Linder

Waldron

Senator Earline Rogers

Gary

Representative Richard Mangus

Lakeville

Philip J. Sachtleben
Executive Director
Legislative Services Agency

COMMISSION ON COURTS

Membership Roster

Representatives

Jesse Villalpando, Chairperson
Griffith

Ralph Ayres
Chesterton

Ed Mahern
Indianapolis

Kathy Richardson
Noblesville

Senators

Richard Bray, Vice-Chairperson
Martinsville

David Ford
Hartford City

William Alexa
Valparaiso

Timothy Lanane
Anderson

Lay Members

Randall Shepard
Indianapolis

Ernest Yelton
Brazil

William Overdeer
Columbia City

C. Joseph Anderson, Jr.
Terre Haute

Sarah Taylor
Indianapolis

Staff

George Angelone
Attorney for the Commission

Susan Preble
Fiscal Analyst for the Commission

A copy of this report is available on the Internet. Reports, minutes, and notices are organized by committee. This report and other documents for this Committee can be accessed from the General Assembly Homepage at <http://www.state.in.us/legislative/>.

I. STATUTORY AND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL DIRECTIVES

IC 33-1-15-7 directs the Commission on Courts to do the following:

- (1) Review and report on all requests for new courts or changes in jurisdiction of existing courts.
- (2) Conduct research concerning requests for new courts or changes in jurisdiction of existing courts. This research may include the conduct of surveys sampling members of the bar, members of the judiciary, and local officials to determine needs and problems.
- (3) Conduct public hearings throughout Indiana concerning requests for new courts or changes in jurisdiction of existing courts. The Commission shall hold at least one (1) public hearing on each request presented to the Commission.
- (4) Review and report on any other matters relating to court administration that the Commission determines appropriate, including the following:
 - (A) Court fees.
 - (B) Court personnel, except constables that have jurisdiction in a county that contains a consolidated city.
 - (C) Salaries of court officers and personnel, except constables that have jurisdiction in a county that contains a consolidated city.
 - (D) Jury selection.
 - (E) Any other issues relating to the operation of the courts.

The Commission is required by IC 33-1-15-7 to submit a report to the General Assembly before November 1 of each year.

The Legislative Council assigned the following additional responsibilities to the Commission:

Study issues concerning the jurisdiction and procedures of the Indiana Tax Court.

II. INTRODUCTION AND REASONS FOR STUDY

The Commission on Courts was established by the 1991 General Assembly to review the need for additional courts and for changes in the jurisdiction of existing courts. The Commission's creation was a result of the findings of the 1990 Interim Study Committee on Courts and Criminal Law Issues. That Committee found that current statutes contain neither procedures for creating courts nor specific criteria for the General Assembly to use in evaluating the need for new courts. The Committee concluded that this situation had allowed the creation of new courts that could not be justified on the basis of judicial workload.

The General Assembly provided for the expiration of the Commission after four years, on June 30, 1995, thus permitting an evaluation of the work and effectiveness of the Commission at that time. The 1995 General Assembly passed legislation extending the existence of the Commission on Courts until June 30, 1999, and making adjustments in the duties and operation of the Commission. The 1999 General Assembly passed legislation extending the existence of the Commission on Courts until June 30, 2003.

The General Assembly considered but did not enact legislation concerning Tax Court procedures and jurisdiction in the 1999 Session. The topic assigned to the Commission by the Legislative Council was the topic of three bills: EHB 1005, SECTION 23 (1999); HB 1990 (1999), and HB 1991 (1999). Included in HB 1990 (1999) was language proposing a study of Tax Court issues. The Legislative Council selected the Commission to do the study in Legislative Council Resolution 99-1.

III. SUMMARY OF WORK PROGRAM

The Commission met four times in 1999 to carry out its responsibilities. The Commission discussed its proposed work plan in the first meeting. In the first, second, and fourth meetings, the Commission discussed the topic assigned to the Commission by the Legislative Council. In the second, third, and fourth meetings, the Commission discussed all other requests made to the Commission for legislative changes in the law governing courts and court officers.

With respect to the topic assigned to the Commission by the Legislative Council, the Commission took testimony from all persons asking to address the issue. At the conclusion of the testimony, the Commission asked the interested parties to meet and reach an agreement on language to propose to the Commission. The Judge of the Tax Court, the State Board of Tax Commissioners, and members of the Taxation Section of the Indiana State Bar Association participated in these discussions.

In order to identify what legislative changes to make in the law governing courts and court officers, the Chairman of the Commission wrote a letter to each state legislator asking them to identify what legislative changes ought to be placed on the Commission's agenda. The Commission also reviewed the Commission's final report for 1998 to identify which recommendations were not adopted in the 1999 Session of the General Assembly.

The Commission received either written or oral testimony, or both, on each proposal. To better evaluate these proposals, the Commission reviewed the statistical publications of the Division of State Court Administration of the Supreme Court, including 1998 Weighted Caseload Statistics, "Adjusted Weighted Caseload Measures—HB 1148", and 1998 Indiana Judicial Report. The Commission also received fiscal impact statements prepared by the Office of Fiscal and Management Analysis and discussed the progress of the Supreme Court initiative to have counties in each judicial region develop a local and district caseload plan.

The Commission received various other proposals from members of the Commission and the public. The Commission took testimony on proposals submitted by Judge Ernest Yelton and David Gilyan. The Commission did not consider any other proposal, including a proposal to shift financial responsibility for all court employees to the State.

IV. SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

A. Review of Recommendations from 1998

Most of the recommendations made by the Commission in 1998 were enacted by the General Assembly in the 1999 Session. Proposals concerning the following three matters were not:

- (1) Salaries of juvenile magistrates.

- (2) Disclosure of jury lists.
- (3) Judicial salaries.

1. Salaries of juvenile magistrates

This proposal was recommended by the Commission in 1997 and 1998. In 1997, the Commission found the following:

The Commission finds that the juvenile magistrates' were not included in the legislation which converted judges' salaries to fully state paid due to an oversight. Consequently, the Commission finds that the payment of juvenile magistrates' salaries should be paid entirely by the state, rather than sharing the cost with counties.

In 1998, the Commission found that the need for this proposal "is still present". See PD 3346 (1999). The Commission determined in 1998 that the proposal would affect juvenile magistrates in Allen County, Elkhart County, Johnson County, Lake County, Marion County, Porter County, Vanderburgh County, and Vigo County. The Commission learned in 1999 that the proposal would also affect a juvenile magistrate in Lawrence County.

2. Disclosure of jury lists.

In 1998, Rep. Ayers brought to the attention of the Commission that the confidentiality of jury lists is not addressed in several jury selection statutes. The Commission found "that a need exists to keep jury lists confidential in certain circumstances." The Commission prepared legislation that would have given a judge in Lake County or a county that adopts the alternative jury selection procedures added by P.L. 4-1998 the option of making a jury list confidential if the judge believes that public disclosure would endanger the safety of potential or selected jurors or lead to jury tampering. See PD 3432 (1999).

3. Judicial salaries.

In 1998, the Indiana Judges Association brought the issue of judicial salaries to the Commission. The Commission made the following findings and recommendations:

The Commission on Courts finds that a salary increase for court officers is needed. The Commission on Courts finds that the discretionary maximum \$5,000 county supplement should be eliminated.

This finding affects all judges except judges for small claims courts, city courts, and town courts.

B. Jurisdiction and Procedures of the Indiana Tax Court

HB 1990 (1999) proposed changes both in the structure of the Tax Court and in the procedures related to the adjudication of property tax cases. HB 1991 (1999) dealt solely with property tax case procedures. Neither bill was enacted into law. Introduction of the bills was influenced by the following:

- (1) The magnitude of the current backlog of property tax appeals pending before the State Board of Tax Commissioners.
- (2) The number of high profile property tax cases that have been overturned by the Supreme Court.

The following alternative ways to restructure the Tax Court were suggested:

- (1) Abolish the Tax Court and return cases to their counties of venue.
- (2) Treat the Tax Court more like other trial courts and direct appeals from the Tax Court to the Court of Appeals, rather than to the Supreme Court.
- (3) Reestablish the Tax Court as a panel of three judges by rotating two judges from the Court of Appeals to the Tax Court to hear tax cases on a part-time basis.
- (4) Reestablish the Tax Court as a panel of three judges by rotating two circuit or superior court judges to the Tax Court to hear tax cases on a part-time basis.
- (5) Reestablish the Tax Court as a panel of three judges by appointing two additional judges to serve on the Tax Court on a full-time basis.
- (6) Add two magistrates to the Tax Court.

The State Board of Tax Commissioners is primarily interested in applying provisions from the Administrative Orders and Procedures Act (IC 4-21.5) to the adjudication of property tax appeals. This change will allow the State Board to better utilize its staff. Under current law, appeals before the Tax Court involve an evidentiary hearing. Matters heard by the Tax Board are largely re-litigated. Elimination of the evidentiary proceedings before the Tax Board would allow the Tax Board personnel to allocate more time toward reducing the backlog of appeals pending before the Tax Board. In addition, the change would increase the quality of presentations made to the Tax Board by the affected tax officials.

Some of the provisions of IC 4-21.5 are inappropriate for the adjudication of property tax matters. HB 1990 (1999) and HB 1991 (1999) identified some of these provisions. As a result, the changes being suggested by the Tax Board might be accomplished either by incorporating the relevant provisions of IC 4-21.5 by reference into IC 6-1.1 and IC 33 or by crafting a separate procedure in IC 6-1.1 and IC 33 that is modeled on the procedures in IC 4-21.5. The Tax Board recommends that the proposal includes the following essential changes:

- (1) Require Tax Court review of Tax Board decisions to be based on the record developed in the proceedings before the Board.
- (2) Allow no witnesses, including Board hearing officers, to testify in appeals before the Tax Court.
- (3) Place the burden of proof that a county determination is in error on the taxpayer.

The proposals for restructuring the Tax Court are not all equally acceptable to the judge of the Tax Court. The addition of two magistrates or the addition of two full-time judges to the Tax Court are the most acceptable of the structural proposals for the Tax Court. In general the judge of the Tax Court has no problems with the procedural proposals made by the State Board of Tax Commissioners.

The concern over the reversal rate of Tax Court decisions may not be fully justified. A comparison of the percentage of Tax Court cases reversed by the Supreme Court to the

percentage of Court of Appeals cases reversed by the Supreme Court reveals that the Tax Court reversal rate is in line with other appellate courts. The Supreme Court has found no error in the bulk of the Tax Court's rulings.

The Tax Court was created to eliminate the deficiencies in the system that existed prior to its creation. By:

- (1) funneling all tax cases to a single judge, the Indiana General Assembly has ensured that decisions would be made by a person with tax expertise and experience;
- (2) giving the Tax Court statewide jurisdiction over tax cases, the Indiana General Assembly has made it possible for a body of consistent, uniform, and binding tax law to develop; and
- (3) directing appeals to the Supreme Court, the Indiana General Assembly has shortened the time required for a tax law ruling to become final and eliminated conflicts between different panels of the Court of Appeals.

The Council of the Taxation Section of the State Bar Association is not in favor of making a structural change in the Tax Court. The Council is willing to work with the State Board and the Tax Court to develop changes in the procedures used in property tax appeals.

C. Local Management of Caseloads

1. Unified Delaware Circuit Court

Senator Craycraft and Senator Bray requested that the Commission recommend to the General Assembly that the Delaware Circuit Court and Delaware Superior Courts be reorganized as a unified circuit court in a manner similar to the unified Monroe Circuit Court. The judges support the proposal. The proposal would not have a fiscal impact. The proposal would assist the judges in implementing local case load plans.

2. Vigo County Courts

Rep. Kersey requested that the Commission recommend to the General Assembly that the two county courts in Vigo County be converted into superior courts with the same jurisdiction as the other superior courts in the county. The judges support the proposal. The proposal would not have a fiscal impact. The proposal would assist the judges in implementing local case load plans.

3. Huntington Superior Court Referee

Senator Wheeler requested that the Commission recommend to the General Assembly that the Huntington Superior Court be given the authority to appoint a part-time referee and other personnel as the court determines necessary. The judge supports the idea. The proposal was favorably considered by the Senate and the House of Representatives in the 1999 Session as part of ESB 155. However, ESB 155 did not pass. The 1998 weighted caseload statistics prepared by the Division of State Court Administration of the Supreme Court indicates that Huntington County has a need for additional court officers. The proposal would not have a state fiscal impact. The proposal would assist the judges in implementing local case load plans.

D. Other Proposals for Courts and Court Officers

1. County Courts

Judge Ernest Yelton, Judge of the Clay Circuit Court and a member of the Commission, suggested that all of the remaining 10 county courts in Indiana be converted to superior courts. This proposal would affect two county courts in Vigo County, two county courts in Madison County, and one county court in each of the following counties: Blackford County, Dearborn County, Floyd County, Montgomery County, Orange County, and Rush County. The conversion of the two county courts in Vigo County is also the subject of a separate proposal submitted by Rep. Kersey.

The members of the Special Courts Committee of the Indiana Judicial Conference, who are the judges of the 10 county courts in Indiana, voted 9 to 1 to support legislation converting all county courts to superior courts. The majority of the committee members supported the proposal because of the fact that General Assembly has converted the county courts to superior courts in 84 counties and the conversion of the county courts in the remaining eight counties would allow each of the affected counties to better balance work loads among the courts in the county. The county court judge in Floyd County voted against the proposal because of his concern that fewer county resources would be devoted to resolving small claims.

2. Allen Circuit Court

Rep. Pond requested that the Commission recommend to the General Assembly that hearing officer appointed under IC 33-4-1-2.8 be replaced with a full-time magistrate appointed under IC 33-4-7 and that the Allen Circuit Court be granted concurrent jurisdiction with the Allen Superior Court over Title IV-D matters. The Allen Circuit Court currently share concurrent jurisdiction in paternity matters. The Allen Circuit Court hearing officer has been appointed by the Allen Superior Court to serve as a Title VI-D referee. In this capacity, the salary of the hearing officer is partially reimbursed with federal funds. The proposal would facility the implementation of a family court concept in Allen County. The judges of the Allen Circuit Court and the Allen Superior Court support the proposal.

3. Bartholomew Circuit Court and Jackson Circuit Court

Rep. Bailey, Rep. Yount, and Rep. Steele requested that the Commission recommend to the General Assembly that one additional full-time magistrate be appointed under IC 33-4-7 to serve the Bartholomew Circuit Court and Jackson Circuit Court. The judges agree that a joint arrangement would work and that transportation and office space would not be a problem. The local county councils, county commissioners, and bar associations support the arrangement. The 1998 weighted caseload statistics prepared by the Division of State Court Administration of the Supreme Court indicates that Bartholomew County and Jackson County have a need for additional court officers.

4. DeKalb Superior Court

Rep. Kruse requested that the Commission recommend to the General Assembly that the part-time small claims referee serving the DeKalb Superior Court be replaced by an additional judge. The 1998 weighted caseload statistics prepared by the Division of State Court Administration of

the Supreme Court indicates that County has a need for additional court officers. The circuit and superior court judges support the proposal. The County has completed the remodeling of the Court House to provide space for the additional court. The county commissioners, the county council, and the local bar association also support the proposal.

5. Howard Circuit Court and Howard Superior Court

Rep. Herrell and Senator Johnson requested that the Commission recommend to the General Assembly that one additional full-time magistrate be appointed under IC 33-4-7 to serve the circuit and superior courts. The 1998 weighted caseload statistics prepared by the Division of State Court Administration of the Supreme Court indicates that Howard County has a need for additional court officers. The judges support the proposal.

6. Lake Superior Court, Juvenile Division

Judge Mary Beth Bonaventura requested that the Commission recommend to the General Assembly that a magistrate for the Lake Superior Court, Juvenile Division who is currently being paid from a federal grant be replaced with a full-time magistrate appointed under IC 33-4-7. The 1998 weighted caseload statistics prepared by the Division of State Court Administration of the Supreme Court indicates that the number of judges and magistrates assigned to the Lake Superior Court, Juvenile Division exceeds the number of judges needed by the Division, as estimated using statewide case workload statistics. However, the division of State Court Administration notes that "increasing demands on juvenile courts to expedite CHINS and other case types may make additional staffing necessary". The Office of Judge Mary Beth Bonaventura contacted Staff Counsel for the Commission on Courts by telephone and asked that this request be withdrawn from consideration by the Commission at this time.

7. Jurisdictional Limits in Lake County

David Gilyan requested that the Commission increase the jurisdictional limits for small claim cases in Lake County. The Lake County Bar Association supports an increase in the jurisdictional limits for small claims cases. Under the proposal, the following changes would be made in the jurisdictional amount for the small claims docket in each of the following courts:

Court	Change
Lake Superior Court, County Division	\$3,000 to \$10,000
Crown Point City Court	\$500 to \$10,000
Lake Station City Court	\$500 to \$10,000
Whiting City Court	\$500 to \$10,000
Schererville Town Court	\$500 to \$10,000
Gary City Court	\$3,000 to \$10,000
Hobart City Court	\$3,000 to \$10,000
East Chicago City Court	\$3,000 to \$10,000
Hammond City Court	\$3,000 to \$10,000
Merrillville Town Court	\$3,000 to \$10,000

Lake County is in the process of developing a judicial district case management plan to comply with the mandate imposed by the Supreme Court. The Lake Superior Court, County Division has

not fully evaluated what impact this proposal would have on the Court. The Chairman of the Commission on Courts requested that the Court provide additional information addressing this issue. No further information was received.

8. Lawrence Circuit Court

Rep. Steele requested that the Commission recommend to the General Assembly that the juvenile magistrate serving the Lawrence Circuit Court be replaced with a full-time magistrate appointed under IC 33-4-7 to serve the circuit and superior courts. Replacement of the juvenile magistrate in Lawrence County is also the subject of a separate proposal concerning the replacement of juvenile magistrates in all affected counties.

9. Madison Circuit Court and Madison Superior Court

Rep. Mellinger requested that the Commission recommend to the General Assembly that one additional full-time magistrate be appointed under IC 33-4-7 to serve the circuit and superior courts. The 1998 weighted caseload statistics prepared by the Division of State Court Administration of the Supreme Court indicates that Madison County has a need for additional court officers. The proposed district caseload management plan will not significantly reduce the need for an additional court officer. The judges support the proposal.

10. Marion Circuit Court and Marion Superior Court

Sen. Clark requested that the Commission recommend to the General Assembly that two additional magistrates be appointed under IC 33-4-7 for the Marion Circuit Court and 16 additional magistrates be appointed under IC 33-4-7 for the Marion Superior Court. The 1998 weighted caseload statistics prepared by the Division of State Court Administration of the Supreme Court indicates that there is a need for the additional court officers. At least four of the magistrates would be used to assist the Juvenile Court. The additional magistrates are needed to bring the workload down to a manageable level and to allow the Juvenile Court to better serve the public. Some of the additional magistrates would be used to implement a family court concept in Marion County. The courts do not have an agreement with the Marion City-County Council concerning how and where to house the additional magistrates.

11. Owen Circuit Court

Sen. Bray requested that the Commission recommend to the General Assembly that the part-time magistrate serving the Owen Circuit Court be replaced with a full-time magistrate appointed under IC 33-4-7. Owen County is a resource poor county. Continued funding of the part-time magistrate causes a burden on county property taxpayers that is not shared by taxpayers in other counties that have a full-time magistrate paid with state funds.

Owen County shares the same problem as other counties with only one judge. There are times that justice cannot be administered because the judge is involved with another case or the judge has a conflict of interest affecting the litigants. The presence of a magistrate helps solve these problems.

12. Porter Circuit Court

Rep. Ayers requested that the Commission recommend to the General Assembly that the juvenile magistrate serving the Porter Circuit Court be replaced with a full-time magistrate appointed under IC 33-4-7. Replacement of the juvenile magistrate in Porter County is also the subject of a separate proposal concerning the replacement of juvenile magistrates in all affected counties. The proposal is supported by the Porter County Commissioners and the Porter County Council.

V. COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Reaffirmation of 1998 Recommendations

Salaries of Juvenile Magistrates

Findings: The Commission found in 1997 and 1998 "that the juvenile magistrates were not included in the legislation which converted judges' salaries to fully state paid due to an oversight. Consequently, the Commission finds that the payment of juvenile magistrates' salaries should be paid entirely by the state, rather than sharing the cost with counties." The Commission finds that the need for this proposal is still present.

Recommendations: The Commission recommends that juvenile magistrates in Allen County, Elkhart County, Johnson County, Lake County, Lawrence County, Marion County, Porter County, Vanderburgh County, and Vigo County become full-time magistrates adopted and payable in conformity with IC 33-4-7. See PD 3346 (1999).

Disclosure of Jury Lists

Findings: The Commission found in 1998 "that a need exists to keep jury lists confidential in certain circumstances." The Commission finds that the need for this proposal is still present.

Recommendations: The Commission recommends the preparation of legislation that would give a judge in Lake County or a county that adopts the alternative jury selection procedures added by P.L. 4-1998 the option of making a jury list confidential if the judge believes that public disclosure would endanger the safety of potential or selected jurors or lead to jury tampering. See PD 3432 (1999).

Judicial Salaries

Findings: The Commission found in 1998 "that a salary increase for court officers is needed." The Commission finds that the need for this proposal is still present.

Recommendations: The Commission recommends that any bill that increases judicial salaries also eliminate the discretionary \$5,000 maximum county supplement payable to judges.

Jurisdiction and Procedures of the Indiana Tax Court

Findings: The Commission finds that:

- (1) there is a severe backlog of property tax assessment appeals pending before the State Board of Tax Commissioners;
- (2) the backlog has been difficult to address, in part, because the State Board of Tax Commissioners has needed to devote substantial resources to relitigating various issues in cases in which the determination of the State Board of Tax Commissioners has been appealed to the Tax Court;
- (3) adoption of procedures similar to the procedures in the Administrative Orders and Procedures Act (IC 4-22-2), including the development of a complete record for all issues heard by the State Board of Tax Commissioners and limiting judicial review by the Tax Court to review of the record developed by the State Board of Tax Commissioners will address this problem; and
- (4) the Tax Court, the State Board of Tax Commissioners, and representatives of the Taxation Section of the Indiana State Bar Association are in substantial agreement on language that would implement this solution.

Recommendations: The Commission recommends the enactment of PD 3512 (2000). However, before enacting PD 3512 (2000) the Commission recommends that the General Assembly determine whether there is a possible conflict between SECTION 4 and SECTION 6 of PD 3512 (2000), which could be addressed by inserting language cross referencing the two provisions or by other means.

Local Management of Caseloads

Unified Delaware Circuit Court

Findings: The Commission finds that unification of the Delaware Circuit Court and the Delaware Superior Court into a unified Delaware Circuit Court similar to the unified circuit court in Monroe County:

- (1) does not have a state or local fiscal impact;
- (2) has substantial local support;
- (3) was favorably considered by the House of Representatives in HB 1732 (1999); and
- (4) would help the courts in Delaware County balance their caseloads.

Recommendations: The Commission recommends the enactment of the provisions in HB 1732 (1999) which organize the circuit and superior courts in Delaware County into a unified circuit court.

Conversion of Vigo County Courts

Findings: The Commission finds that conversion of the two county courts in Vigo County to superior courts:

- (1) does not have a state or local fiscal impact;
- (2) has substantial local support; and

(3) would help the courts in Vigo County balance their caseloads.

Recommendations: The Commission recommends that the county courts in Vigo County be converted to superior courts and given the same jurisdiction as other superior courts in Vigo County.

Huntington Superior Court Referee

Findings: The Commission finds that legislation granting authority to the Huntington Superior Court to appoint a referee and other court personnel as the court determines necessary:

- (1) will not have a state fiscal impact;
- (2) was considered by both Houses of the General Assembly in the 1999 Session as part of ESB 155;
- (3) would be similar to legislation enacted in previous sessions for many other courts;
- (4) has substantial local support;
- (5) is justified based on the case load of the Huntington Superior Court; and
- (6) empowers Huntington County to provide a local solution to its case management problems.

Recommendations: The Commission recommends the enactment of the provisions of ESB 155 (1999), which grants authority to the Huntington Superior Court to appoint a referee and other court personnel as the court determines necessary.

Other Proposals for Courts and Court Officers

Findings: The Commission finds that:

- (1) there is a need for additional court officers, including the replacement of part-time court officers with full-time court officers;
- (2) the 1998 weighted caseload statistics prepared by the Division of State Court Administration of the Supreme Court indicate that, after adjusting for the judges and magistrates authorized in HEA 1148 (1999), the most severe shortage of court officers is in:
 - (A) Allen County;
 - (B) Bartholomew County;
 - (C) Clark County;
 - (D) Dearborn County;
 - (E) DeKalb County;
 - (F) Elkhart County;
 - (G) Floyd County;
 - (H) Howard County;
 - (I) Huntington County; and
 - (J) Jackson County; and

(3) the Supreme Court is engaged in a process of reviewing judicial district and county case load management plans which may have an impact on what additional court officers are needed in some counties.

Recommendations: The Commission recommends that the General Assembly address the need for additional court officers after considering the judicial district and county case load management plans that are under consideration by the Supreme Court.

WITNESSLIST

Referee Cynthia Amber
Allen Superior Court

Rep. Ralph Ayers
Indiana House of Representatives

Rep. William Bailey
Indiana House of Representatives

David Bottorff
Association of Indiana Counties

Senator Richard Bray
Indiana Senate

Tim Brooks
Chairman
State Board of Tax Commissioners

Judge Barbara Brugnaux
Vigo County Court #5

Judge Paul R. Cherry
DeKalb Circuit Court

Judge Mary Lee Comer
Hendricks Superior Court
President, Indiana Judges Association

Senator Allie Craycraft
Indiana Senate

Judge Richard Dailey
Delaware Superior Court #2

Judge Thomas Fischer
Indiana Tax Court

Judge Patricia J. Gifford
Presiding Judge
Marion Superior Court

David Gilyan
Attorney
Lake County

Judge Mary R. Harper
Porter Circuit Court

Judge Jeffrey R. Heffelfinger
Huntington Superior Court

Judge Stephen Heimann
Bartholomew Circuit Court

Judge David W. Hopper
Madison County Court #1

Judge James J. Jordan
Delaware Superior Court #3

Lilia G. Judson
Executive Director
Supreme Court
Division of State Court Administration

Magistrate Deborah A. Kapitan
Lake Superior Court, County Division

Judge Wayne Lennington
Delaware Superior Court #4

Ron Miller
Statistical Analyst
Supreme Court
Division of State Court Administration

Judge Lynn Murray
Howard Circuit Court

Stephen Paul
Baker & Daniels
Taxation Section, Indiana Bar Association

Magistrate Edward Page
Lake Superior Court, Criminal Division

Judge James W. Payne
Marion Superior Court

Magistrate Diane Kavadias Schneider
Lake Superior Court, County Division

Larry Stroble
Barnes & Thornburg
Taxation Section, Indiana Bar Association

Rep. Vern Tincher
State Legislator

Bill Waltz
State Board of Tax Commissioners

Judge Kevin P. Wallace
DeKalb Superior Court

Judge Michael G. Witte
Dearborn County Court
Chairman, Special Courts Committee
Indiana Judicial Conference

Travis Worl
Association of Indiana Counties